## **REMARKS**:

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 10, and 12-16 have been amended herein. The Examiner has indicated that claim 2 is allowed.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,729 (Robins '729) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,249,058 (Murata '058).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

Robins '729 discloses that "the camera may comprise a display (109) on which image data or status information may be shown" (column 2, lines 11-13). Robins '729 fails to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended, including at least the following features: "information presentation part," in combination with the other claimed features. Murata '058 fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Robins '729.

Robins '729 discloses that "If the camera is digital, the operation of sensor at the image surface (103) may be controlled by control signals (105) from logic unit (110), and image information signals (104) flow from the sensor to the logic unit (110)" (column 2, lines 15-18).

Robins '729 fails to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features as set forth in claim

15, as amended, including at least the following features: "said control part ... generates

presentation information," in combination with the other claimed features. Murata '058 fails to

remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Robins '729.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended, including at least the following

features: "an information presentation part that presents information showing that the image

taken by the shutter operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the other claimed

features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 6, as amended, including at least the following

features: "an information presentation part that presents information showing that the image

taken by the shutter operation is an image at the focus position in the middle of the focusing

action," in combination with the other claimed features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 10, as amended, including at least the following

features: "a process that presents information showing that the image taken by the shutter

operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the other claimed features.

-13-

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 12, as amended, including at least the following

features: "a process that presents information showing that the image taken by the shutter

operation is an auto-focusing image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 13, as amended, including at least the following

features: "generating presentation information showing that the image taken by the shutter

operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 14, as amended, including at least the following

features: "generating presentation information showing that the image taken by the shutter

operation is an auto-focusing image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

the combination of features as set forth in claim 15, as amended, including at least the following

features: "said control part ... generates presentation information showing that the image taken by

the shutter operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Robins '729 and Murata '058, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest

-14-

the combination of features as set forth in claim 16, as amended, including at least the following

features: "said control part ...generates presentation information showing that the image taken by

the shutter operation is an auto-focusing image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of

claims 1, 6, 10, and 12-16 should be withdrawn. Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Claims 7 and 8

depend from claim 6. It is submitted that this rejection of claims 3, 7, and 8 should be withdrawn

by virtue of their dependency.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S.

Patent No. 6,549,729 (Robins '729) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,249,058 (Murata '058)

and U.S. Patent No. 7,119,843 (Terasaki '843).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

Terasaki '843 discloses "The phone body 1 includes a push button operation part 7, a

liquid crystal display part 8, a speaker part 9, and a microphone part 10" (column 4, lines 37-39).

Terasaki '843 states "The display controller 114 controls the liquid crystal display part 8 for

displaying data inputted from the key pad, a status of transmitting and receiving operation etc."

(column 8, lines 4-6).

-15-

Terasaki '843 fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Robins '729 and

Murata '058.

Robins '729, Murata '058, and Terasaki '843, alone or in combination, fail to describe,

teach, or suggest the combination of features as set forth in claim 1, as amended, including at

least the following features: "an information presentation part that presents information showing

that the image taken by the shutter operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the

other claimed features.

Robins '729, Murata '058, and Terasaki '843, alone or in combination, fail to describe,

teach, or suggest the combination of features as set forth in claim 6, as amended, including at

least the following features: "an information presentation part that presents information showing

that the image taken by the shutter operation is an image at the focus position in the middle of the

focusing action," in combination with the other claimed features.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 9 depends from claim 6. Accordingly, in view of

the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 5 and 9 should be

withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

3. The Examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent

No. 6,549,729 (Robins '729) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,249,058 (Murata '058) and

-16-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/826,501

Response filed May 22, 2009

Reply to OA dated January 22, 2009

U.S. Patent No. 5,001,507 (Iida '507).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

Iida '507 discloses: "Reference numeral 19 denotes a CRT forming the electronic

viewfinder, which receives the output from the demodulator circuit 18 and the horizontal and

vertical synchronizing signals output from the synchronous signal separation circuit 14 and

displays the image of the object on the CRT with the focus detection area pattern superimposed

thereupon" (column 4, lines 8-14).

Iida '507 fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Robins '729 and Murata

'058.

Robins '729, Murata '058, and Iida '507, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach,

or suggest the combination of features as set forth in claim 10, as amended, including at least the

following features: "a process that presents information showing that the image taken by the

shutter operation is a fixed focus image," in combination with the other claimed features.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10. Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants

respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn by virtue of its

dependency.

-17-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/826,501 Response filed May 22, 2009

Reply to OA dated January 22, 2009

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number

indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an

appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other

fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Darren Crew

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 37,806

DC/IIf

Atty. Docket No. 040075 Suite 400

1420 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 659-2930

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time

-18-